THE MILITANT

Published Twice a Month by the Communist League of America (Opposition)

Vol.III,No.30 | NEW YORK, N. Y| September 15 1930 | PRICE 5 CENTS

In Stalin's Exile

RAKOVSKY IN DANGER!

The silence of the leadership of our Party and the International continues to be profound. We will continue without cease our appeal to the workers for the Bolshevik Oppositionists deported by Stalin.

Above all, comrade Christian Rakovsky must be saved!

The workers must be informed, and to those responsible for the Party's policy, we must constantly raise the question: What are you doing to the Left Opposition in the U..S.S.R.? Why do you persecute it? Justify your repressive measures if you can!

On Rakovsky

(Extract from a Letter)

. . . Rakovsky is writing an enormous amount. Whatever reaches us is read by all; in this sense Christian Georgevitch is doing a great work. His position does not differ one whit from our own (that of Trotsky); like ourselves, he is resisting the Party regime. Here are some extracts from one of his last cards:

"All our warnings have been verified much more rapidly and fully than we might have imagined. Right now a retreat is being beaten, and the positions are being abandoned, evidently by the usual zig-zags. The slogan of 'generalized collectivization in three years' still continues only for the purpose of frightening the middle peasant and increasing the retail price by its presssure. The middle peasant will be the axis around which the turn of 180 degrees in Centrist policy will revolve.

"After Centrism, without resistance, ruined the economy of the middle peasant, it will again begin to make a fetich of him, with the ritual sacrifices, not on the backs of the bureaucracy—which everybody would have to approve——but at the expense of the poor peasants and the proletariat" . . .

Letter from Russia

. . . By chance I received some information on the solitary prison of N. One of our comrades confined there previously developed the theory of the "ferment" that is, that we are ferment of the next revolutionary rise, but today, in his letter, a change is to be felt. Everybody works to deepen and increase his theoretical knowledge, they study and strengthen their knowledge of foreign languages, with a marked preference for German. The discussions go on without cease. The subjects: knowledge of the world, space, time, mechanics, the sorties of the Right wing, the "third period",etc., etc. Nothing more can be learned of the essence of the discussions, since all abstract considerations are censored or held back by the censor; even the situation with regard to food is part of the mystery of the solitary prisons. Hunger strikes are frequently carried on. The causes are the regime, and apparently, the food; after the first hunger strike, they forced the permission to receive twelve letters instead of four letters a month. The strike was long, there were many seriously ill. The second hunger strike was a protest against the bastonnades (beating with sticks). As a result ,the prisoners were refused all communication with the outer world. The old social democrcy left the prisons and places of exile much more healthy than the Bolsheviks will leave the solitary prisons of Stalinism . . . .

June, 1930. —N.N.

Issues in the Elections

Capitalist Parties Put Up Fake Issues to Conceal Jobless Sufferings

Sufficient has occurred in the last few weeks to show on what basis the twin capitalist parties intend to conduct the election campaign: Prohibition—for and against! The faithful servant of Tammany Hall, Governor Roosevelt, has issued a "courageous" statement for the repeal of the 18th Amendment. The "wet" Republicans of New York are warning the Party high priests that unless they do the same, the parched Party sheep will flock to the flowing brooks of the "Democracy". In Illinois, the Democratic senatorial nominee, J. Hamilton Lewis, has declared the great issue to be bringing the government back to "the principle of the fathers", which, if he refers to the George Washingtons, means cheap booze. Michigan has already defeated two prominent dry Republican Congressmen in the primaries. Vermont has given an unknown "wet" a nomination over a prominent "dry". The same comedy is being enacted everywhere.

The socalled prohibition issue is the best one that could be chosen—for the capitalist class. It conveniently cuts across party lines so that neither singly nor together can they be made responsible for aything. It is an expedient gas gun for shooting clouds around fundamental and really burning issues.

Is there mass unemployment, misery, starvation, suicide in the country? Booze will solve that! Are wages being cut to the very marrow? Booze will make the workers forget that! Is a form of social insurance needed by the workers? No, it's beer and light wines they need! Are the workers clubbed during strikes, bludgeoned at demonstrations of the jobless, evicted from their homes? Prohibition caused it all! Do the workers want bread? Give them beer and they won't need bread! Is there a bleak winter ahead, a winter of deepened crisis of horrible suffering, of food riots perhaps and certainly of bitter struggles to resist the offensive of the capitalist class? Give them a prohibition prize-fight to distract their minds from woe and strugle!

The dislike and total incapacity of the capitalist parties to face the real problems the masses are confronted with, are quite understandable. Republican or Democrat —they are the ramparts of the system that produces wars, unemployment, crises, misery, child labor, exploitation, inequality and oppression with an ever-increasing frequency and permanency. Their crimes and festering corruption are the crimes and corruption of capitalism, with which the whole country is reeking like a pestilence. For a worker to support them is to kiss the chains that enslave him and with gratitude the blows he receives.

Reformist Aides to Capitalism

Then should he support the Socialist party? No. If the Republican and Democratic parties are the ramparts of capitalism, the Socialist party is the ditch around the fortress that traps those who seek to storm it. The socialist party has removed every mention of the class struggle from its program, constitution and works. But it has not left the class struggle; it has only become an assistant to capitalism. It is the party of the petty bourgeoisie. It is the party of the respectable business men who faithfully manage the municipal affairs of Reading and Milwaukee for the capitalist class. It is the devoted workman who goes about his master's house, with plaster and trowel, begging for permission to cover up the more unsightly holes in the decaying structure.

Does it offer promises to the workers? Certainly! More even than its masters offer. It offers a MacDonald regime in the United States, a regime which has so effectively "solved" unemployment in England that millions are still on a miserable dole; it has "solved" the oppression of imperialism in India by massacring the Indian people. Haven't Hillquit and Co. endorsed the British "Labor" government? Aren't they in one and the same "socialist" international? Are they not "comrades" of Zoergiebel, the butcher of Berlin's proletariat, and Poncour, the agent of the French war mongers? Are they not in the party of the "socialist' trade union racketeers who practise for power by beating up and expelling Left wing workers? They are the gay deceivers of the working class, typified by Mr. Heywood Broun and Mr. Norman Thomas, who keep the workers from fighting their class enemy by telling them that their lot can be improved by voting against capitalist politicians.

Vote Communist

The worker's vote should go to the worker's party—the Communist Party. All our differences with it, our criticisms of its internal regime and its ruinous policies, does not change the fact that it is the only political party of the working class in the field which stands for a revolutionary struggle against capitalism and all power to the proletariat. The casting of a paper ballot does not and cannot decide the burning problems of the workers. But support for the Communist campaign draws the workers more closely together, and enables them to transform the electoral farce into a genuine fight for the demands of the workers—not in futile polling booths, but in serious class struggle.

Vote Communist!

A Yankee Revolution in the Argentine

Militarist "revolutions" in South America are occurring with bewildering frequency and abruptness. First Bolivia, then Peru, now Argentina, and tomorrow, perhap, Brazil. In virtually every one of these countries, the boiling over of conflicting elements results from the volcanic heat generated by the world capitalist crisis. Even more precisely, the "revolutions" in question mirror the unconcealed rivalry between Britain and the United States. In both these imperialist powers, their anarchistically organized industries and means of distribution are paralyzed, their home markets sluggish and contracted, their financial systems in disorder. Primarily for these two, it has become a matter of economic existence to fight tooth and nail for a larger share of the world market, limited as it is. This struggle for markets, raw material, spheres of influence and the like, produces the most violent eruptions in every corner of the world, of which the recent events in South America are only characteristic.

The overthrow of the tyrannical butcher of the Peruvian toiling masses, Leguia, the Wall Street adjutant who was surrounded by American financial and naval "advisors", marked an offensive of Britain against the Yankee dollar—never very popular with the Latin American masses—which has yet to say its final word.

With almost the precision of a military counter-offensive comes the engineered uprising in Argentine with its removal of the notoriously pro-British Irigoyen administration and the establishment of the pro-American Uriburu dictatorship. Both the American and British imperialist press treat the event with a frankness for which we can only be thankful: the former greets it with unfeigned glee, the latter with apprehension. The United States, with its hypocritical "policy" of not recognizing Latin-American governments that have succeeded to power by "violence", is quite prepared to make an exception in the Argentine case.

In all these "revolutions", the native bourgeois demagogues have skilfully utilized the dissatisfaction of the masses with the economic crisis and tyrannical dictatorship. They have used the workers and peasants for "troops of the popular revolution" and coolly driven them back to a position of quiescence and subjugation as soon as they have seized power. For the masses, in a word these "revolutions" have no progressive significance, and often a more reactionary one.

What is even more disturbing is the complete absence of the Communist movement in these affairs. They appear nowhere as a political factor. They do not even appear to attempt to turn the guns of the masses aginst the militarist puppets of the native bourgeoisie and imperialism. The truth is: They have been crushed and rendered impotent by the ravages of Stalinism, which has virtually dissolved the once promising Communist movement in the Latin-American countries.

The German Elections

We go to press too soon to report the outcome of the elections in Germany, and must therefore leave it to the next issue to contain a detailed analysis of the results. In this case. however, as in all capitalist elections, the casting of ballots is far from the decisive question. The fate of Germany and its working class will be decided in the open field of the class struggle. The problem for the bourgeoisie is its ability to unload the burden of the crisis upon technico-industrially weaker countries and by intensified exploitation of the working class, in order to carry out the Young Plan. The answer depends largely upon the Communist Party and its ability to mobilize for struggle the workers still in retreat. The failure of the Communist Party can bring the same ruinous consequences to the proletariat as did the failure of the Brandler leadership of the C.P.G. in 1923. On the temper and mood of the proletariat, which will be partially guaged by the elections this week, depends the question—in a political sense—of whether the bourgeoisie will go forward with its "democratic" dictatorship supported by the servile collaboration of the social democrats, or prepare for an open Fascist dictatorship. Unfortunately, the Communist Party under the misleadership of its Thaelmanns, Remmeles and Neumanns offer too insufficient guarantee or hope of an intelligently revolutionary leadership of the masses for today and the coming day.

George Saul Tours for Opposition

Comrade George J. Saul has begun a national speaking tour for the Communist League of America (Opposition) opening up in Denver, Colorado, with a number of street meetings. From Denver, he will proceed to Kansas City, with a possible meeting in Sterling en route. In Kansas City, two or three meetings are scheduled for him. One of them is a meeting of the Communist League branch, another is a public meeting in Forum Hall, 1218 East 12th Street, September 16th , 8 p.m., on "Boss Persecutions in the South", and a street meeting may also be arranged. St. Louis is also arranging a branch and public meeting for comrade Saul in the Public Library. From St. Louis, it is expected to continue the tour through Springfield, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Youngstown, Pittsburgh and points in the vicinity.

Comrade Saul was one of the active figures in the Colorado coal strike of a few years ago, and recently one of the leaders of the textile struggles in the South. He was sentenced to six months on the chain gang in the Carolinas for his activities. His recent agreement with the standpoint of the Communist League brought about his expulsion from the official Communist Party. On this tour, comrade Saul is speaking on "Boss Persecutions in the South", "Problems of the American Working Class", and the "Program of the Communist League". Further details on the tour will be published in forthcoming issues of the Militant.

THE RESULTS OF THE GERMAN ELECTIONS

will be the subject of the next open meeting of the N.Y. Branch of the Communist League of America (Opposition)

Max Shachtman

will be the speaker

Questions and Discussion will follow

The meeting will be held in the

Stuyvesant Casino

9th St. and 2nd Ave. Room 3,

Thursday, September 25, at 8 p m. sharp

All Invited Admission Free

An Opportunist Campaign

The Communist Party in the Elections

Two declarations of the Left Opposition. intimately related to each other, are being confirmed with greater rapidity than many expected. The first is that Centrism has no independent or consistent political line of its own. The second, that the stormy ultra-Left zigzag of Centrism is only a prelude to a new rampage in the direction of crass opportunism. The contentions are already being confirmed in all the important parties of the Comintern, including the Russian. In the United States, it is most crudely manifested in the present election campaign of the Party.

Conditions for Election Work

Why and under what conditions do Communists participate in parliamentary activities? Among the many conditions, these stand out: To utilize the interest aroused among the workers during election times for revolutionary agitation and organization of the workers. To point out that the Communists do not seek seats in order to use the bourgeois state apparatus as an instrument of the workers, but to use it as a forum where the decadent bourgeois parliamentarism is exposed and the illusions of the workers in it shattered To utilize election periods in particular to mobilize the workers against the stifling farce of the polling booths and for transferring their demands and attention outside parliamentary boundaries and into the open field of struggles, (demonstrations, strikes, etc., etc.) To advocate such minimum (immediate) demands as do not reform capitalism (that is the job of the social democrats) but as entrain masses in struggle outside the ballot box deception, and incessantly to combine the minimum and maximum programs of the revolutionary proletariat, the immediate demands with the final aim of the seizure of power. To point out to the workers that parliament and elections are a sham and a **deception practised upon** them by t bourgeoisie and their reformist lieutenants, that reforms cannot improve their wretched lot which is produced by the system as a whole.

In the United States, where so many millions of workers participate in elections, where parliamentary illusions are deep and strong, where reformist quackery has been so prevalent and nefarious, and socialist reformism has assumed (for decades) such a crude bourgeois character, the observance of the above-mentioned conditons are imperatively needed gurantees for a Communist movement against a degeneration into opportunism. In the present elections campaign, however, they have been honored more in the breach than in the observance and that with calamitous results.

Our Proposals

A few months ago, the Left Opposition, through the Militant, proposed a number of concrete issues as a program of action for the Communist movement. Leading them was the need of a campaign for social insurance that would set a broad class movement going and involve masses in struggle. At that time the proposal was not only strictly taboo in the columns of the official Party press and all Party documents, but it was looked at with a glaringly suspicious eye by the Stalinist mannikins as something akin to if not worse than "social fascism".

We never conceived such a campaign in the sense of a vulgar parliamentary comedy—that goes without saying. We urged it upon the Party, which finally accepted it when word had come from Moscow that even in the "third period" such a proposal was not entirely a bad one. It was from then on that we were presented with an almost incredible performance which reaches new depths with the passage of every day. From yesterday's hardly concealed contempt for "social fascist insurance", the Party leaders swung around their customary 180 degrees, and turned the issue —which can have a serious significance only as a demand for which workers actually fight—into a cheap electoral game.

To begin with, a "social insurance bill" was formally drafted by the Party, in the best manner of skilled parliamentarians. We are even ready to acknowledge that the bill is perfectly legal and its language irreproachable. Too legal and irreproachable, in fact. It tells us that "a **national public (!) emergency** now exists in the United States of America". A leaflet of the New York Party District informs us that the "Communists **offer a remedy" (!)**; and the **Daily Worker** adds: Society owes these categories of workers a living." In fact, the only essential difference between the "Communist Bill" and the Socialist party's panaceas is that the C.P. demands $25 a week per unemployed worker, to be paid by the government, while the S.P. does not demand so much. A very cheaply purchased "radicalism", indeed!

How the Opportunists Write of Their Bill

This very parliamentary "bill" has become the very acme of the struggle for social insurance conducted by the Party, the "center of the election campaign" as the **Daily Worker** says. We refrain from quoting much from the Daily Worker, but a few sentences must be cited here. They are breath-taking.

"A vote for the candidate of the Communist Party **is a vote for the enactment of the Unemployment Insurance Bill"** (8-29-1930).

The Party called together a "mass unemployment united front" for the purpose of discussing . . . "the enactment of the Workers' Social Insurance Bill as proposed by the Communist Party" (9-10-1930).

"This bill must not only be brought to the workers in the shops, trade unions, for their endorsement, but the Party must also consider **the utilization of the initiative and referendum laws** as a means of struggle for this bill." (8-2-1930).

In what way does this destroy the parliamentary illusions of the workers, or direct their attention and efforts to the extra-parliamentary field? The answer is: In no way! Instead of telling the workers bluntly and honestly that even their simplest and most elementary demands can be attained—not by "bills" and ballot boxes—but by genuine mass demonstrations and strikes (we do not mean the kind the **Daily Worker** organizes at its headline desks), by arousing the mass organizations of the workers to fight for these demands, the Party glues the eyes of its followers to a . . . bill. What has suddenly happened to the "third period", to the "revolutionary upsurge", to the "crisis worse than 1914", to the "possession of the streets"? They have been dissolved into a legally perfect, irreproachably worded "bill" to be presented for "enactment" to Congress.

That is not all. Combined with this miserable campaign of opportunism, is similar reformist nonsense, subsidiary in form but no less harmful.

"The funds necessary for such insurance," writes the **Daily Worker,** "can be provided by 1. **Stopping armaments and other war preparations** and assigning the **funds hitherto spent for these purposes** to a social insurance fund." (8-29-1930). No "genuine" pacifist could fail to be delighted with such a proposal, which is also advanced in the form of a slogan: "Not a cent for war."

Petty Bourgeois Pacifism

Not once but a hundred times did Lenin excoriate the petty bourgeois pacifists in the ranks of the socialist movement who advanced these and similar proposals and slogans. His strictures remain just as correct today, even when they must be directed against the chameleons of the "third period". Not so very long ago, the whole Party was stirred up against Bittelman for his petty bourgeois slogan: "No more cruisers!" Does the new pacifist slogan of armaments and war differ in any essential from Bittelman's? It does not. Like its predecessor, it has no place in a Communist movement.

It may be objected that these are "isolated quotations". This objection is not valid. The quotations are only typical of what can be read every day in the **Daily Worker** and the rest of the Party press. The "bill" itself was drafted by the Party leadership—evidently with the practised aid of some of the present "leaders" who not so long ago studied how to be good parliamentarians under Victor Berger, Algernon Lee, Louis Waldman, Meyer London and Morris Hillquit. The editorials cited are written by no less a figure than C.A. Hathaway, graduate **cum laude** of the "Lenin" school, and now member of the almighty Party secretariat. The turn from ultra-Leftism is quite official.

* * *

This is not the first time this has happened. After the Fifth Congress of the Comintern, which followed the collapse of the Right wing leadership in Germany (1923) and Czecho-Slovakia, the International Centrist regime also embarked on a short-lived "Leftist" zig-zag. It was the period of Ruth Fischer and Treint leaderships and policies, of "playing at soldiers" as it was later termed. But this ultra-Leftist jag was only the prelude to the worst period of opportunism in Comintern history: the adventure with Chiang Kai-Shek, with La-Follette, with Raditch and other "peasant" leaders, with Messrs. Purcell and Co. The indications are that such a catastrophic swing is to be repeated now.

Centrism has no consistent policy of its own. It is a parasite which lives on the pieces it bites of from the Left and Right alternately, but it always ends by sinking a foot deeper into the swamp of opportunism. As in 1925-1927, it is carrying through a turn to the Right with an accompaniment of ultra-Left trumpets.

A turn from the prevailing ultra-Leftist course, embodied in the spurious philosophy of the "third period" is essential for the Party. But Centrism cannot execute such a turn without springing back to its old Right wing positions. The vigilance and comradely criticism of the Left Opposition must assist the Communist workers in the ranks of the Party to make the turn from the present line to the positions of Marxism. —S—n

(The next issue of the Militant will further discuss concrete election problems. —Ed.)

Comrade Andres Nin Expelled from Russia

Comrade Andres Nin, former member of the Profintern secretariat and leader of the Spanish Communist movement, was deprived of all work and removed from his post in 1928 after his courageous speech at the fourth Congress of the R.I.L.U.

Nin had definitely sided with the Left Opposition: he had excoriated the opportunist trade union policy of the Anglo-Russian Committee, he had developed the international perspectives of the Opposition, and our point of view on the Chinese question.

Since then, Nin was held a prisoner in Moscow. But his presence irritated the Stalinists and they have just accomplished their base aims by expelling him under scandalous conditions.

Since hypocrisy and "high politics" are a part of such a game, the French and Chinese delegates to the recently concluded fifth congress were made to propose a resolution endorsing the expulsion.

Comrade Nin was expelled on August 21 under shameful conditions. Arrested by agents of the G.P.U. he was seized as being guilty of "counter-revolutionary actions" by virtue of article 58 of the Soviet code, like comrade Trotsky, and conducted to the frontier, without a cent, wthout a document, without his family!

He was still held a few days by Stalin's guards, and his wife, together with two children—one 7 years old and the other 2 years old—held with him.

The bureaucracy of Stalin knows no limits. The revolutionary workers must ask the leaders of the T.U.U.L. for an explanation of the case of Nin.

Upon their return, the American delegates to the R.I.L.U. congress must be asked for details on the case of Nin.

Nin is a tested revolutionist. With him, as with our non-Russian comrades, as with comrade Santini who is now in Moscow, Stalin and his valet Losovsky, do not dare to employ the solitary prison, exile, or the rifle squad—they must limit themselves with expulsions. But these methods dishonor the revolutionary trade union movement.

The Left wing militants in this country must conduct a persevering struggle against these methods which not only play into the hands of the Right wing and reaction, but destroy the prestige and effectiveness of the Communist movement.

THE MILITANT, Vol.III,No.30September 15 1930. Published twice monthly by the Communist League of America (Opposition) at25 Third Avenue, New York, N. Y. Subscription rate: $2.00 per year; foreign $2.50. Five cent per copy. Bundle rates 3 cents per copy. Editorial Board: Martin Abern, James P. Cannon Max Shachtman, Maurice Spector, Arne Swabeck. Entered as second class mail matter, November 28 1928 at the Post Office at New York, N. Y. under the act of March 3, 1879 (Total No. 55)

Our Reply to the Right Wing

Lovestone's «United Front» Maneuver

(At a recent meeting, the national committee of the Communist League of America (Opposition) considered the "open letter" sent by the Lovestone group to our organization and to the official Communist Party. The letter, calling for a "United Front", is published in full in the current issue of **Revolutionary Age**, organ of the Right wing, to which interested readers can refer for the full text from which quotations contained in the following document are taken. The letter which follows is the reply addressed publicly to the Right wing by the national committee of the League.)

* * *

We have received your letter of July 26, 1930 appealing for our "cooperation in setting up a united revolutionary front" as well as a copy of the resolution on "Trotskyism" adopted at the Plenum of your group. Both of these documents are of great significance for us. The resolution is the result of our incessant demand that the Lovestone group take a definite and formal position on the principle questions raised by the Left Opposition. This it failed to do ever since its removal from the leadership of the Party, a policy of evasion which evidently could no longer be maintained even in the ranks of that group itself. Furthermore, the resolution marks a retreat to a certain extent from the position maintained by the Lovestone group while it controlled the Party,—a position now untenable for the Lovestone leadership after the Left Opposition has had the opportunity of breaking through the conspiracy of lies and misrepresentations with whch the official Communist apparatus, Foster and Lovestone, surrounded the disputed points. That the resolution is permeated with opportunism and continued falsification is not the subject of this letter, which is primarily concerned with the appeal for a united front.

The United Front

The tactic of the united front is neither a maneuver nor a trick for us. We regard it as a serious means of mobilizing the masses of the workers not yet Communists for a struggle, on the basis of a minimum program, against the attacks of capitalism and its agents in the working class. Such a united front we cannot reject, all the more so since it is we who have constantly urged it on the labor movement in general and its revolutionary section in particular.

But a united front or bloc with the Lovestone group is not the same to us as a united front with a trade union or other labor organizations containing workers of varying shades of opinion without a definite political program and theoretical conception. Precisely because the Lovestone group calls itself Communist, the question of a bloc with it must be examined most closely and pre-conditions of a much higher order must be required. Before establishing these pre-conditions, a few preliminary observations must be made.

The appeal reads: "The revolutionary movement in this country finds itself weak, demoralized and divided . . . the capitalists and their agents are exploiting this division . . . at no time would refusal to to cooperate in uniting the revolutionary forces be more criminal."

But it is precisely the Lovestone group which is chiefly responsible for this division, for its leadership initiated the campaign of expulsions of socalled "Trotskyists"; it is precisely this leadership which by its expulsion and assaults upon our group, its "refusal to cooperate in uniting the revolutionary forces" rendered itself criminally responsible. It was this leadership that failed "to consider the broad interests of the revolutionary and labor movement" by expelling our comrades, not only from the Party but from every auxiliary organization under its control—including trade unions. The failure to acknowledge honestly and openly the source and responsibility for the movement's division and demoralization in the past and present, makes any improvement in the future impossible. One cannot wash one's hands of the past by a dishonestly naive silence.

The appeal proposes the setting up of a joint committee of the three groups in the movement "to present the point of view of Communism, the point of view of those who stand by and defend the Soviet Union".

Unity with "Counter-Revolutionists"?

But it is the Lovestone group, together with the Stalinist apparatus, which has for years assailed us as "counter-revolutionists and the worst enemies of the Soviet Union", as the "agents of Chamberlain and Chiang Kai-Shek". We have not yet seen an acknowledgement that these declarations were infamous slanders which constituted the regular payment made by the Lovestone leadership to the Stalin-Bucharin regime for allowing it to run the American Party. One may therefore assume that the Lovestone leaders still retain these "convictions" concerning us. How then is it possible to appeal to counter-revolutionists and enemies of the Soviet Union to "present the point of view of those who stand by and defend the Soviet Union"? Or are we to believe that the Lovestone leaders are not and have not been serious in denouncing us as counter-revolutionists. In that case, it is necessary for them to admit plainly that they have for years been practising a disgraceful deception upon the workers' movement.

It is further necessary for us to point out that the principal cause of the present crisis in the Communist movement, manifested by division and demoralization is, the theoretical standpoint and practical activities of the Lovestone group and its international allies since 1923. It is impossible to enter a bloc with the Lovestone group while it retains and defends these conceptions It is impossible to try to solve the crisis and overcome the division in the Communist movement by a "united front" with the elements that caused the crisis.

Moreover a united front with the Lovestone group—since the official Party bureaucrats can still prevent the Party from joining such a front—would constitute an unprincipled bloc against the Center, i.e., against the Party. It would end in a miserable fiasco (as did the Lovestone "united front" in the textile industry), or as a rallying ground for anti-Party forces. We are aiming, on the contrary, to restore the Party to a Marxist foundation, since it is our Party from which no clique of bureaucrats can seperate us.

A united front of all Communist workers is esential. A determined effort must be made to overcome the crisis now raging in the movement. We have advocated such a front and we continue to propose it now. But we do not stand for an abstract unity, or bloc, but for one that has a basis in principle. With its present views on essential questions, and its evasion or silence on many others, a bloc with the Lovestone group is out of the question. Such a bloc demands certain pre-conditions which we hereby pose to the Lovestone faction:

Questions to Lovestone

1. One of the reasons for the crisis, the division and demoralization of the movement over which you express so much concern, has been the prevention of open discussion. Meetings have been broken up, raids on private homes conducted, comrades physically assaulted. These methods are still used in the Party against all Oppositions, on the basis of the precedent of gangsterism you established in the struggle against our group. There can be no issue from the present difficulties, and no genuine unity, without a condemnation of these atrocious methods, which means in the first place an open renunciation of your own past crimes in this respect. Otherwise no basis can be laid for a free and intelligent discussion of the problems of the movement.

2. One of the main reasons for the crisis and split is the expulsion of the Left Opposition from the Party. This was executed primarily by your group, at that time in control of the Party. It is necessary to know if this is still the official attitude of your group. Else how can you appeal to unite us into a movement to present the point of view of Communism while expelling us from the Communist Party?

3. But our group is only the American section of the international Left Opposition. The expulsion of these comrades, and particularly of the Russian Bolshevik-Leninists, has been of enormously destructive effect to the movement, reflected in the American Party as well as elsewhere. Comrade Trotsky has been deported to Turkey, and thousands of the best Bolsheviks exiled and imprisoned in the U.S.S.R. Bolshevik fighters have even been assasinated by Stalin. Up to now the Lovestone group has maintained a cowardly silence on these crimes. But without the release from prison and exile of the Oppositionists, the return to the U.S.S.R. of Trotsky, and their full reinstatement into the Party, no progress can be made in overcoming the division and demoralization in the movement. Does the Lovestone group intend to prefer a "diplomatic" silence on this burning question to a protest and demand?

4. No bloc is conceivable for us without a revolutionary policy in the trade unions. On this point we have had only vague ambiguities from your group. Recently, your official organ, **Revolutionary Age,** has given its hearty endorsement to the action of Hais and Co. in Czecho-Slovakia in surrendering the independent Red unions under their control to the Amsterdam International. This piece of liquidation was labelled by you as a step in the "unification" of the Czech working class. Does that signify that in the United States, where the Left unions are relatively even smaller than the reformist trade unions, you favor a similar liquidation of, let us say, the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union into the reformist International Ladies Garment Workers Union? The "logic" of Hais' action in Czecho-Slovakia would seem to apply in the American instance with even greater force—from your point of view. As you are aware, we condemn such actions unreservedly. Clarification on the trade union question is a **sine qua non** for any sort of bloc on principle grounds.

5. A united front of Communist workers or groups pre-supposes a certain amount of mutual confidence. The whole past course of your goup does not inspire us with any. Your spokesmen and your press continue systematically not only to "interpret" our position, but to falsify it deliberately. The resolution on Trotskyism of your Plenum is a typical instance. We find there a repetition of the hodge-podge of known falsehoods, half-truths, consciously forged quotations that were pressed into service against the Left Opposition since the opening of the campaign against it in 1923. We find there a cheap falsification, unworthy of the dignity of a Communist, of our position on the danger of Thermidorian elements in the Soviet Union. Such methods are intolerable, even if they are characteristic of the whole struggle against a socalled Trotskyism. We demand an end of these falsifications and misrepresentations of our viewpoint.

Our reply is dictated solely by our insistence upon the maintenance of a principled point of view in the Communist movement. We are little concerned with the noises emanating from the empty barrels in charge of the official Party today, to the effect that the "Lovestoneites and Trotskyists are now merged" to fight the Party. The avowal by the Lovestone group itself that its differences with the Centrists are of a minor character compared with its differences with the Left Opposition which are of a principle charater. speaks for itself and shows that in its whole philosophy the Right wing stands immeasurably closer to Centrism than does the Left wing. This clarification of the principle position has a great value.

Nor is our reply dictated by any desire for unity as such and on any basis. Our aim is the re-conquest and unification of the revolutionary movement on the basis of Marxism and the living experiences of Communism in the last two decades.

National Committee
Communist League of America (Opposition)

An Answer and a Challenge to a Debate

The Communist League of America (Opposition) has received a letter from Bertram D. Wolfe, head of the Workers School of the Lovestone group, proposing a symposium of the three groups in the movement, the Party, the Lovestone group, and ourselves. In reply, the following letter was sent to Wolfe.

* * *

In your letter of August 14, 1930, you declare:

"The New Workers School therefore invites the Communist Party of the U.S.A., the Communist League of America, and the Communist Party (Majority Group) to send one representative each to present their respective viewpoints at a symposium discussion under a chairman selected by the Civil Liberties Union where they will be able freely to voice their opinions on the present crisis in the Communist movement and the respective meritts of the three groups proposals for remedying the situation.

Such an invitation can only be welcomed by us, particularly since, from the very beginning of our struggle and expulsion from the Communist Party, we have insistently proposed a public debate before the Communist and Left wing workers, of the groups. We issued a public challenge, as you will remember, at the time Bertram D. Wolfe was lecturing against us immediately after our expulsion. At that time, the group you represent was in control of the Party and deliberately prevented such a discussion and debate not only by expelling us from the Party's ranks, but by resorting to the most disgraceful methods of slander falsehoods and even physical violence. After your own expulsion from the Party, we again proposed on a number of occasions that you agree to debate our respective viewpoints. Up to now this was refused. Such a debate, however, remains as necessary now as it was in the past.

It is quite clear that the official Communist Party will not consent to participate in the proposed symposium. Since only two groups would be represented, your own and ours, we propose instead of a "symposium" a debate. We have already selected our spokesman for such a debate. In addition, we have chosen a committee of two to meet with a similar committee representing your group, to decide on the title of the debate, the time, the place, the chairman, the auspices and all other details.

As soon as you shall have done the same, we are ready to meet together and work out all the necessary arrangements.

Communist League of America (Opposition)

Socialist Indignation

During the sessions of the Second International at Zurich the Swiss government refused permission to enter its borders to the inoffensive Pietro Nenni, of the Italian Socialist Party. This was the occasion for great indignation among the leaders of the socialist international who are accustomed to much more deference from bourgeois governments. With an academic solemn pen, they addressed a protest against the denial of "hospitality" by the Swiss government to a proscribed politician.,

Now we know the social democratic conception of democratic "hospitality": It consists of patronage by the bourgeois governments to social democratic leaders. But it is never to be extended to proscribed revolutionists who fight implacably against the capitalist order. Even when the social democrats themselves hold the reins of bourgeois government, they apply this hospitality exclusively to the bourgeoisie and its servitors. This rule was not transgressed by the MacDonalds and Muellers in excluding from this democratic "hospitality" the Communist Leon Trotsky. But when the Swiss government failed to maintain the laws regulating relations between the bourgeoisie and their socialist footmen, the latter protested. Their sorrowful and resigned indignation is comprehensible.

STALIN AS A THEORETICIAN

By L. D. TROTSKY

The Peasant's Balance Sheet of the Democratic and Socialist Revolutions

> " . . . the appearance of comrade Stalin at the conference of the Marxist agronomists—was epochal in the history of the Communist Acadamey. As a consequence of what Stalin said, we had to review all our plans and revise them in the direction of what Stalin said. The appearance of comrade Stalin gave a tremendous impetus to our work."
> —(Pokrovsky, at the 16th Congress)

In his programmatic report to the conference of the Marxist agronomists (December 27, 1929), Stalin spoke at length about the "Trotsky-Zinoviev Opposition" considering "that the October revolution, as a matter of fact, did not give anything to the peasantry". It is probable that even to the respectful auditors, this invention seemed too crude. For the sake of clarity, however, we should quote these words more fully: "I have in mind," said Stalin, "the theory that the October revolution gave the peaseantry **less (!) than the February revolution,** that the October revolution, as a matter of fact, , gave nothing to the peasantry." The invention of this "theory" is attributed by Stalin to one of the Soviet statistical economists, Groman, a known former Menshevik, after which he adds: "But this theory was seized by the Trotsky-Zinoviev Opposition and utilized against the Party." Groman's theory regarding the February and October revolutions is quite unknown to us. But Groman is of no account here altogether. He is dragged in merely to cover up the traces.

In what way could the February revolution give the peasantry more than the October? What did the Februaary revolution give the peasant in general, with the exception of the superficial and therefore absolutely uncertain liquidation of the monarchy? The bureaucratic apparatus remained what it was. The land was not given to the peasant by the February revolution. But it did give him a continuation of the war and the certainty of a continued growth of inflation. Perhaps Stalin knows of some other gifts of the February revolution to the peasant? To us, they are unknown. The reason why the February revolution had to give way to the October is because it completely deceived the peasant.

The alleged theory of the Opposition on the advantages of the February revolution over the October is connected by Stalin with the theory "regarding the socalled scissors". By this he completely betrays the sources and aims of his chicanery. Stalin polemicizes, as I will soon show, against me. Only for the convenience of his operations, for camouflaging his cruder distortions, he hides behind Groman and the anonymous "Trotsky-Zinoviev Opposition" in general.

The real essence of the question lies in the following. At the 12th Congress of the Party (in the spring of 1923) I demonstrated for the first time the threatening gap between industrial and agricultural prices. In my report, this phenomenon was for the first time called the "price scissors". I warned that the continual lagging of industry would spread apart this scissors and that they might sever the threads connecting the proletariat and the peasantry.

In February 1927, at the Plenum of the Central Committee, while considering the question of the policy on prices, I attempted for the one thousand and first time to prove that general phrases like "the face to the village" merely avoided the essence of the matter, and that from the standpoint of the "Smytchka" (alliance) with the peasant, the problem can be solved fundamentally by correlating the prices of agricultural and industrial products. The trouble with the peasant is that it is difficult for him to see far ahead. But he sees very well what is under his feet, he distinctly remembers the yesterdays, and he can draw the balance under his exchange of products with the city, which, at any given moment, is the balance-sheet of the revolution to him.

The expropriation of the landowners, erated the peasant from the payment of a sum amounting to from five to six hundred million rubles (about $275,000,000—Ed.). This is a clear and irrefutable gain for the peasantry through the October—and not the February—revolution.

But alongside of this tremendous plus, the peasant distinctly discerns the minus which this same October revolution has brought him. This minus consists of the excessive rise in prices of industrial products as compared with those prevailing before the war. It is understood that if in Russia capitalism had maintained itself the price scissors would undoubtedly have existed—this is an international phenomenon. But in the first place, the peasant does not know this. And in the second, nowhere did this scissors spread to the extent that it did in the Soviet Union. The great losses of the peasantry due to prices are of a temporary nature, reflecting the period of "primitive accumulation" of state industry. It is as though the proletarian state borrows from the peasantry in order to repay him a hundred-fold later on.

But all this relates to the sphere of theoretical considerations and historical predictions. The thoughts of the peasant, however, are empirical and based on facts as they appear at the moment. "The October revolution liberated me from the payment of half a billion rubles in land rents," reflects the peasant. "I am thankful to the **Bolsheviks**. But state industry takes away from me much more than the capitalists took. Here is where there is something wrong with the **Communists**." In other words, the peasant draws the balance sheet of the October revolution through combining its two fundamental stages: the agrarian-democratic ("Bolshevik") and the industrial-socialist ("Communist"). According to the first, a distinct and incontestable plus; according to the second, so far still a distinct minus, and **to date** a minus considerably greater than the plus. The passive balance of the October revolution, which is the basis of all the misunderstandings between the peasant and the Soviet power, is in turn most intimately bound up with the isolated position of the Soviet Union in world economy.

Almost three years after the old disputes, Stalin, to his misfortune, returns to the question. Because he is fated to repeat what others have left behind them, and at the same time to be anxious about his own "independence," he is **compelled** to look back apprehensively at the yesterday of the "Trotskyist Opposition" and . . . cover up the traces. At the time the "scissors" between the city and the village was first spoken of, Stalin completely failed to understand it for five years (1923-28), he saw the danger in industry going too far ahead instead of lagging behind; in order to cover it up somehow, he mumbles something incoherent in his report about "bourgeois prejudices (!!!) regarding the socalled scissors". Why is this a prejudice? Wherein is it bourgeois? But Stalin is under no obligation to answer these questions, for there is nobody who would dare ask them.

If the February revolution had given land to the peasantry, the October revolution with its price scissors could not have maintained itself for two years. To put it more correctly: the October revolution could not have taken place if the February revolution had been capable of solving the basic, agrarian-democratic problems by liquidating private ownership of land.

We indirectly recalled above that in the first years after the October the peasant obstinately endeavored to contrast the Communist to the Bolsheviks. The latter he approved of—precisely because they made the land revolution with a determination never before known. But the same peasant was dissatisfied with the Communists, who having taken into their own hands the factories and mills, supplied commodities at high prices. In other words, the peasant very resolutely approved of the agrarian revolution of the Bolsheviks but manifested alarm, doubt, and sometimes even open hostility towards the first steps of the socialist revolution. Very soon, however, the peasant had to understand that Bolshevik and Communist are one and the same Party,

In February 1927, this question was raised by me at the Plenum of the Central Committee in the following manner:

The liquidation of the landowners opened up large credits for us with the peasants, political as well as economic. But these credits are not permanent and are not inexhaustible. The question is decided by the correlation of prices. Only the acceleration of industrialization on the one hand, and the collectivization of peasant economy on the other, can produce a more favorable correlation of prices for the village. Should the contrary be the case, the advantages of the agrarian revolution will be entirely concentrated in the hands of the Kulak, and the scissors will hurt the peasant poor most painfully. The differentiation in the middle peasantry will be accelerated. There can be but one result. The crumbling of the dictatorship of the proletariat. "This year," I said, "only eight billion rubles worth of commodities (in retail prices) will be released for the domestic market . . . the village will pay for its smaller half of the commodities about four billion rubles. Let us accept the retail industrial index as twice the prewar prices figure, as Mikoyan has reported . . . .The balance (of the peasant): 'The agrarian-democratic revolution brought me aside from everything else, five hundred million rubles a year (the liquidation of rents and the lowering of taxes). The socialist revolution has more than covered this profit by a two billion ruble deficit. It is clear that the balance is reduced to a deficit of one and a half billion."

Nobody obected by as much as a word at this session, but Yakovlev, the present People's Commissar of Agriculture, though at that time only a clerk for special statistical assignments, was given the job of upsetting my calculations at all costs. Yakovlev did all he could. With all the legitimate and illegitimate corrections and qualifications, Yakovelev was compelled the following day to admit that the balance-sheet of the October revolution for the village is, on the whole, still reduced to a minus. Let us once more produce an actual quotation:

" . . . The gain from a reduction of direct taxes compared with the pre-war days is equal to approximately 630,000,000 rubles . . . In the last year the peasantry lost around a billion rubles as a consequence of its purchase of manufactured commodities not according to the index of the peasant income but according to the retail index of these commodities. The unfavorable balance is equal to about 400,000,000 rubles."

It is clear that Yakovlev's calculations essentially confirmed my opinion: The peasant realized a big profit through the democratic revolution made by the Bolsheviks but **so far** he suffers a loss which far exceeds the profit. I estimated the passive balance at a billion and a half. Yakovlev —at less than a half a billion. I still consider that my figure, which made not pretension to precision, was closer to reality than Yakovlev's. The difference between the two figures is in itself very considerable But it does not change my basic conclusion. The acuteness of the grain collecting difficulties was a confirmation of my calculations as the more disquieting ones. It is really absurd to think that the grain strike of the upper layers of the village was caused by purely political motives, that is, by the hostility of the Kulak towards the Soviet power. The Kulak is incapable of such "idealism". If he did not furnish the grain for sale, it was because the exchange became disadvantageous as a result of the price scissors. That is why the Kulak succeeded in bringing into the orbit of his influence the middle peasant as well.

These calculations have a rough, so to speak inclusive, character. The component parts of the balance sheet can and should be separated in relation to the three basic sections of the peasantry; the Kulaks, the middle peasants and the poor peasants. However, in that period—the beginning of 1927—the official statistics, inspired by Yakovlev, ignored or deliberately minimized the differentiation in the village, and the policy of Stalin-Rykov-Bucharin was directed towards protecting the "powerful" peasant and fighting against the "shiftless" poor peasant. In this way, the passive balance was especially onerous upon the lower sections of the peasantry in the village.

Nevertheless, where did Stalin get his contrasting of the February and October revolutions, the reader will ask. It is a legitimate question. The contrast I made between the agrarian-democratic and the industrial-socialist revolutions, Stalin, who is absolutely incapable of theoretical, that is, of abstract thought, vaguely understood in his own fashion: He simply decided that the democratic-revolution—means the February revolution. Here we must pause, because Stalin and his colleagues' old, traditional failure to understand the mutual relations between the democratic and socialist revolutions, which lies at the basis of their whole struggle against the theory of the permanent revolution, has already succeeded in doing great damage, particularly in China and India, and remains a source of fatal errors to this day. The February 1917 revolution was greeted by Stalin essentially as a Left democrat, and not as a revolutionary proletarian internationalist. He showed this vividly by his whole conduct up to the time Lenin arrived. The February revolution to Stalin was and, as we see, still remains a "democratic" revolution par excellence. He stood for the support of the first provisional government which was headed by the national liberal landowner, Prince Lvov, had as its war minister the national conservative manufacturer, Gutchkov, and the liberal, Miliukov, as minister of foreign affairs. Formulating the necessity of supporting the bourgeois landowning provisional government, at a Party conference, March 29, 1917, Stalin declared: "The power has been divided between two organs, not one of which has the complete mastery. The roles **have been divided.** The Soviet has actually taken the **initiative** in revolutionary transformations; the Soviet—is the revolutionary leader of the rebellious people, the organ which **builds up** the provisional government. The provisional government has actually taken the role of the **consolidator** of the conquests of the revolutionary people . . . Insofar as the provisional government consolidates the advances of the revolution —to that extent we should support it."

The "February" bourgeois, landowning and thoroughly counter-revolutionary government was for Stalin not a class enemy but a collaborator with whom a division of labor had to be established. The workers and peasants would make the "conquests", the bourgeoisie would "consolidate" them. All of them together would make up the "democratic revolution". The formula of the Mensheviks, was at the same time also the formula of Stalin. All this was spoken of by Stalin a month after the February revolution when the character of the provisional government should have been clear even to a blind man, no longer on the basis of Marxist foresight but on the basis of political experience.

As the whole further course of events demonstrated, Lenin in 1917 did not really convince Stalin but elbowed him aside. The whole future struggle of Stalin against the permanent revolution was constructed upon the mechanical separation of the democratic revolution and socialist construction. Stalin has not yet understood that the **October revolution was first a democratic revolution,** and that only because of this was it able to realize the dictatorship of the proletariat. The balance between the democratic and socialist conquests of the October revolution which I drew was simply adapted by Stalin to his own conception. After this, he puts the question: "Is it true that the peasants did not get anything out of the October revolution?" And after saying that "thanks to the October revolution the peasants were liberated from the oppression of the landowners" (this was never heard of before, you see!) Stalin concludes that: "How can it be said after this that the October revolution did not give anything to the peasants?"

How can it be said after this—we ask—that this "theoretician" has even a grain of theoretical conscience?

(To Be Continued)

NOTES OF A JOURNALIST -:-:-:-:- By ALFA

Two or Not Even One?
(Blucher's Enigmatic Speech)

One of the first sessions of the Sixteenth Party Congress was greeted by the commander of the Far Eastern army, Blucher. This fact in itself has no political significance and would hardly deserve mention. Neither has the fact a Party significance: If, as a soldier, Blucher is far inferior to Budenny for instance, then in a Party sense he is very little superior to him. Besides Blucher's speech of greetings was edited beforehand in the office of Voroschilov and therefore very badly edited. But the spirit of the flunkey who falls in line at command was consistent to the end. There were the enraptured acclaim of Stalin and the ardent greetings to Voroschilov, and several jabs aimed at the Right wing before whom Blucher stood at attention only the day before. Everything is in order. There is also an interesting admission: "In the period between the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Congresses, our Party and Communist Youth organization in the army carried on a successful struggle against counter-revolutionary Trotskyism." The Fifteenth Congress, as was said in its day, drew the final balance under the "struggle against Trotskyism" and liquidated it completely. Now we hear from Blucher that "a successful struggle against Trotskyism" was carried on in the army for the last two and a half years, between the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Congresses. We must assume that at the Seventeenth Congress we will find out not a little of instructive value concerning the further course of this struggle which is no sooner ended than it starts anew. If we live—we shall hear about it.

But we have paused at Blucher's speech not beacuse of this admission, nor because of its general tone, which can be expressed in three words: At your service! In this speech, or at any rate in the reports of it, there is one point which is of serious significance—not as a characterization of Blucher but as a characterization of what is now being done in the Party and what is what is now being done to the Party.

According to the report in **Pravda** of June 28, 1930, Blucher declared:

"We, the fighters in the Red Army, can proudly report to you that during these battles we did not have a single defection, **not a single deserter to the enemy.** The army showed a high political and class devotion to socialist construction."

Every revolutionist can only welcome this information. Unfortunately, however, we have a second version of this point in Blucher's speech which undermines all our confidence in the whole report. In the journal, **Rabotchi,** which is the daily organ of the Central Committee of the White Russian Communist Party, the quotation from Blucher's speech is reported as follows:

"We can proudly report to you that we had no defections nor a single deserter to the camp of the enemy. **We have only two dark, shameful stains: two qualified recruits who were to serve for a period of nine months went over to the enemy. Both of them turned out to be Trotskyists."**

The words we underlined are completely absent from the **Pravda** report. Were they spoken by Blucher or not? If we are to judge by the text we would have to conclude that these words were arbitrarily and incongruously inserted into the report after it was made, as a result of which we have an obvious absurdity. At first it says that there was not "a single deserter" and then it is reported that there were two of them. Obviously, there is something foul here: If there is not a single one, then where did the two come from? And if there really were two deserters then how can one say "not a single one"? But let us assume that it was not Blucher himself who made the ends meet: In the speech unfortunately, there is generally more ardor than sense. But then why did the **Pravda** report omit such tempting information about two deserters? Why did **Pravda** conceal the counter-revolutionary betrayals of the "Trotskyists"? If **Pravda** did not conceal anything, if Blucher did not even say this, then how is it that these words appear on the same day in the Minsk **Rabotchi?**

We know well enough how all the information about the Congress is edited. Not a single line leaves the boundaries of the Congress without a visa from the Press Commission. This means that the information about the Trotskyist-deserters could never have been invented in Minsk. It had to be sent from Moscow with the seal of the Congress Press Commission. But then, once more, why were these lines omitted from **Pravda?** That is the first question.

There is also a second question. "Two qualified recruits went over to the enemy," we are told by Blucher or by somebody supplementing him. "Both of them turned out to be Trotskyists." These words are printed in the Minsk journal in bold face type. Naturally! But here is what is incomprehensible. Between the Fifteenth and the Sixteenth Congresses, according to the words of Blucher, the army was completely purged of the remnants of Trotskyism. Why wasn't it purged of these two also? Evidently they were not known until the moment of their flight. How did Blucher find out that they were "Trotskyists", after they had fled? "Both of them turned out (?) to be Trotskyists." What does he mean "turned out"? How and on what point? The water is dark, so dark that it looks like a stagnant pool. And it also looks as though someone had been splashing around in that pool.

And finally there is a third question: Why did the "Trotskyists" have to flee to the camp of the Chinese counter-revolution? At its head stands Chang Kai-Shek. He was never our ally. He was the ally of Stalin. He came to Stalin for negotiations. A week prior to the bloody **coup d'Etat** of Chiang Kai Shek in April 1927, Stalin in the Hall of the Columns vouched for the loyalty of Chiang Kai-Shek. Chiang Kai-Shek's party belonged to the Comintern with a consultative vote. The Opposition fought against this intransigeantly. Stalin and Rykov exchanged photographs with Chiang Kai-Shek in April 1927, Stalin in ceived a protrait of Chiang Kai-Shek from the office of the Comintern with the request that he give his own portrait to Chiang Kai-Shek in exchange. Trotsky returned the portrait and refused to give his own. Stalin taught that Chiang Kai-Shek's Kuo Min Tang is a substitute for Soviets. The Opposition revealed the alliance between Stalin and Chiang Kai-Shek as a betrayal of the revolution. What grounds, then, could the "Trotskyists" have had for fleeing to the camp of Chiang Kai-Shek? And would it not be better for you, my good sirs, to remain silent about this?

We do not know who fell into this fit of babbling: Blucher, or the editor of his speech, or both of them. But it is clear that somebody here fell into a fit of babbling exceeding the most exceptional norms of verisimilitude. **That is why Pravda refused to print these words.** It was decided there, and not without cause, that this is too stupid. But at the same time the Press Commission of the Congress was reluctant to throw them out: maybe somebody will find some use for them. And really—such an alluring morsel: On the one hand, not a single deserter, which is such an excellent testimonial to the army. On the other hand, fully two deserters, and both of them "Trotskyists"; and this is still better, for it reveals the direct connection between the Opposition and Chiang Kai-Shek. A pity to throw it out: Perhaps it will come in handy in Minsk.

In conclusion, there still remains to take a look at the composition of the Press Commission. It includes the former Social Revolutionists, Berdnikov, who is prepared for any service; Stalin's former secretary, Nazaretian, who has quite a distinct and well-earned reputation; the former Menshevik, Popov, who supplements Berdnikov; the chief cook of the Bureau of Party History, Saviliev; and Stalin's former secretary, Tovstukha. This ought to be enough for anybody.

A Reply To Comrade Weisbord

The speech of comrade Weisbord at the plenum of the Lovestone faction is significant as an example of a strong trend in the Communist movement to consider again the fundamental principle questions in dispute, and to draw closer to the Marxist standpoint of the Left Opposition. The recent adherence to our group of some of the best militants in the official Party, the winning of a section of the youth comrades who formerly followed the Lovestone group, and the present attitude of comrade Weisbord, for years a supporter of the Lovestone faction, —these are incontestable facts which demonstrate that the Left Opposition in the United Sates continues to be the rallying banner for ever-increasing numbers of revolutionary Communists.

They are facts which by themselves are sufficient answer to the pitiful declarations in the camp of the Right wing and the Centrists about our "disintegration", repeated solely for the purpose of retaining domination over militants whom the barrage of anti-"Trotskyism" alone has prevented from endorsing our views.

In this sense, the Communist League of America (Opposition) welcomes the statement of comrade Weisbord. At the same time, it is imperative to indicate some extremely serious defects in it, also typical of a certain confusion that exists in the ranks of many militants who are drawing closer to our point of view. It is not a question here of a number of relatively minor differences of opinion, which are quite admissable within the ranks of the Opposition itself. Nor do we raise the question of criticisms made by comrade Weisbord, which, in any case, can be discussed and solved on the basis of comradely argument and internal democracy. More fundamental questions are involved.

The Need for Clarity

The Communist League is the Left wing of the Communist movement, a faction fighting for the reconstitution of the Communist International on the unshakable foundations of Marx and Lenin which have been systematically undermined by Stalinism. As a faction, its base is necessarily narrower than that of the official Party and its requirements more stringent. Without wasting arguments on the philistine contentions of the Right wing concerning our alleged "sectarianism" (i. e., our insistence upon revolutionary principle), we must establish at all costs a thorough clarity in all fundamental problems of the movement, since without that it is impossible to point the correct road for the movement and help the revolutionary workers in and around the Communist Party tread this road by unloading their artificially appointed "leaders" and their baggage of pernicious theories. That is why, particularly in the case of Weisbord, a comrade who has occupied prominent posts in the work of American Communism and is not in the same position as a new-comer or rank and file worker in the movement, all unclarity and confusion must be energetically opposed.

They exist in Weisbord's views on the problems of the Indian and Chinese revolutions and the relations of the various groups in the movement. What comrade Weisbord entirely fails to see in connection with the guerilla warfare in China is the character of the period. It is not a question of "right" or "wrong" in the Chinese guerilla warfare, but of what **period** we are experiencing in China. Neither Stalinism nor the Lovestones recognize that their Menshevik policies during 1925-27 led to the victory of counter-revolution, the recession of the revolutionary wave, and the virtual decapitation of the Communist movement

Because they consider the defeat of the Chinese revolution as a passing or already passed "episode", the policy of putschism is systematically advocated or condoned by them. They fail to see the need, particularly now in a period of depression of the workers, of re-awakening them, re-grouping them by means of democratic slogans, centering around the demand for a Constituent Assembly. At the same time this cheap "Leftism" is supplemented by the outright Menshevik perspective of the "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry", i.e., a new Kuo Min Tang scandal, a new Kerenskyism.

It is these questions of strategical and tactical significance that must be decided in the Chinese revolution. Only by establishing a sound foundation on them can the present guerilla warfare be estimated correctly, in its proper place, and not in the ambiguous manner into which comrade Weisbord falls.

An Ambiguous Position on India

The same ambiguitv exists in Weisbord's words on India. Side by side with perfectly correct formulations are to be found perfectly confused ones, particularly on the relations of the proletarian movement with the national bourgeoisie. The primary problem of the Indian revolution is not one of an alliance with the national bourgeoisie, but of how to shatter every bit of faith of the masses in that leadership, how to make them rely upon themselves exclusively, to drive the national bourgeoisie (Ghandism in all shades) relentlessly out of the movement. The native bourgeoisie is the principal brake on the popular masses; it is the last and most substantial prop of British imperialism in India.

The economic and political needs of

(Continued on Page 8)

The Sermon on Cockroaches

In his concluding remarks, Stalin spoke about how Rykov, Bucharin and Tomsky becames frightened as soon as "a cockroach stirred somewhere, before it even crawled out of its hole" . . . .The speech evidently referred to the dissatified Kulaks and middle peasants. Further on, however, the above-mentioned cockroach turns out to be "feeble and moribund". This complicates matters somewhat. It may be that a feeble cockroach can stir, but so far as a moribund cockroach is concerned—we would say frankly that we have our doubts. We are quite in accord with the moral that even live cockroaches should not be feared. But on the other hand we assume that under no circumstances should a cockroach be called a raisin, as an economical father once did when a baked cockroach was discovered in his bread. Nevertheless, some people—"economists" if not "economical"—believed and taught others, beginning with 1924, that the Kulak is a myth altogether, that socialism can very well be reconciled with that "powerful middle peasant"—in a word, for four years they ardently converted the cockroach into the raisin of national socialism. This too should have been avoided.

A Self-Portrait of Yaroslavsky

The irreplacable colleague, Yaroslavsky, in the interests of self-criticism, read at the Congress a description of a Communist given by a certain organization in a forsaken locality: "Consistent, politically literate, has no firm convictions of his own. Awaits what other will say." The report records "laughter". But if one stops to think, it is not at all a laughing matter. It is only too true. And maybe this is precisely why it is so ludricious. The province has hit the mark, describing not a man but a type.

Yes, even if we take this same Yaroslavsky. In 1923, he wrote panegyrics to Trotsky. In 1925, he wrote agreeing with Zinoviev's "Leninism", which was directly entirely against Stalin. In 1927, he wrote that Bucharin has no deviations whatever and that he is educating the youth in the spirit of Leninism.

But can it be said that Yaroslavsky is inconsistent? Nobody will say that. He is quite consistent, even too consistent. Politically illiterate? No, of course not. At worst—he is semi-literate. Has he his own firm convictions? It appears that he has not. But why should convictions be firm? They are not metallic. But how is it that Yaroslavsky, without firm convictions, maintains himself at the top? Very simple. He "awaits what others will say".

No, the Congress laughed for nothing. The description fits perfectly.

Problems of the Revolutionary Movement

A Statement of Views on Some Disputed Questions

By ALBERT WEISBORD

(This is the final installment of the speech made before the Lovestone group plenum by comrade Weisbord in which he present his views. The reply of the Communist League is appended.)

* * *

13. India. The basic slogans for the Communists today in India must be Lenin's "Three Pillars", that is, a basic slogan for the proletariat (say the eight hour day) a basic slogan for the peasantry (confiscation of the land) and the slogan of Democratic Republic. To these "three pillars" the slogan "Freedom for India" must be added. Only around all these slogans can the masses be effectively mobilized. It would be a gross error for the Communists to stress the slogan of Freedom for India alone as does the nationalist Indian bourgeoisie. The slogan for "Constituent Assembly" by itself is not incorrect but is incomplete and may be dangerous for it does not take into consideration the fact that British Imperialism can maneuver so as to make the slogan of Constituent Assembly a SUBSTITUTE for a democratic republic. The slogan Constituent Assembly can be used correctly only in conjunction with the slogan for a Democratic Republic.

The Slogan of Soviets

The slogan of Soviets can be appropriate only when a sufficiently acute revolutionary situation has been engendered around the "three pillars", when the class struggle and civil war rages in the villages and towns. In this connection it must be emphasized that Soviets can be built even with the slogan of Constituent Assembly. The two slogans of Constituent Assembly and Soviets need not be antagonistic at all times. But what must be stressed is the actual organization of civil war in the village and town and the leadership of the proletariat in this civil war. Only the dictatorship of the proletariat in India can make permanent its revolution.

The Communists must make plain to the masses the role of the nationalistic Indian bourgeoisie and the role of Ghandi as an agent of this class. Not only the experiences of 1921 must be gone over, but all the treacherous actions of the present Ghandi campaign (the salt campaign, the anti-machine movement, passive resistance, opposition to workers, record at the Nationalist Congress, etc., etc., etc.) must be elaborated. Simultaneously mass movements in town and countryside against native usurer, gentry. kulak. bourgeois, must be effected. By no means must the Chiang Kai-Shek disaster be repeated. The criminal negligence of the C.I. in failing to build the Communist Party but in building worker-peasant parties instead must be speedily liquidated. It is clear it is not **OUR business to organize** peasant parties.

It is clear that the main task of the Communists must be the stimulation of the masses around the "three pillar" and freedom slogans. These movements are directed against both native and foreign rulers and bourgeoisie who may desire a nationalist refolutionary movement under the sole slogan of "Freedom of India" from the British. Nevertheless, and this is most important to understand, so long as a section of the nationalist Indian bourgeoisie is fighting British Imperialism under the slogan of Freedom of India from Imperialist rule, so long as this movement unleashes the energy of the masses which otherwise could not be unleashed and so long as the masses have not been actively mobilized around the correct slogans and while the exposure of the native bourgeoisie is but in its incipiency, it would be manifestly incorrect for the Communists not to enter or to struggle for a national revolutionary front against British Imperialism even though this national revolutionary front would temporarily contain sections of the nationalist revolutionary bourgeoisie (whom the masses follow) even though the sole slogan were "Freedom for India" from British Imperialism and even though later the united front would have to be broken by the development of the class struggle in the villages and towns of India. The center of attack must be against British Imperialism and its conscious reactionary agents within India.

The crime of the C.I. in China (and this opinion is not in contradiction with the basic opinions of comrade Trotsky, it seems) was NOT that the C.P. of China joined a national revolutionary front, but that the C.I. SUBSTITUTED the Kuomintang for the Communist Party, succumbed to Sun Yat Senism, introduced class collaboration against the class struggle, sacrificing the class struggle to this national revolutionary front against foreign imperialism, failing to raise the "Three Pillar" slogans and thus leading the civil war in village and town on concrete demands of the masses against the native exploiters as well. The policy today must be: a national revolutionary front which later will be broken by the progress of the class struggle in India under the leadership of the proletariat (through its Communist Party) in alliance with the peasantry on the road to the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The Problem in China

14. Here too the slogan of the Constituent Assembly is still correct, although it is apparently incorrect to state that the Chinese revolution is still on the wane. Here the mobilization of workers and peasants on concrete issues can lead to such an acute revolutionary situation that Soviets can be formed.

It is dubious to say, as do some members of the International Left Opposition, that the present guerilla warfare going on in China today is wrong and not to be supported. Under the present conditions, if the facts are that masses of desperate peasants are ready to take up civil war in the countryside. the Communists must stimulate, support, organize and lead such a movement. On the other hand, it must be clear that no matter how much the Imperialists and native Chinese rulers may be weakened, armed peasant bands cannot take the place of mass peasant uprisings, the peasant movement can not take the place of a proletarian struggle, and peasant "Soviets" cannot replace the dictatorship of the proletariat.

15. The colonial revolutionary situations in China and India are of the greatest importance to the rest of the world, and to the United States especially. How can we foresee that the United States will "weather the economic storm" and "reach new peaks" unless we foresee aleady the complete and sudden crushing of the revolutionary wave in the Far East. It is the rankest opportunism to fail to connect in the most intimate way the revolutionary situations in the East with the immediate perspective of the United States. All of the Communist groups suffer from this opportunism more or less. Unless this view is corrected it will be true that the revolutions will be defeated, but it will be the Communists who will have aided unconsciously the hangmen both in the East and in the West.

16. The slogan Soviet United States of Europe today seems dubious. Lenin was opposed to this slogan. Today, it may tend to aid reactionary schemes like those of Briand. It should be remembered that among the capitalist nations the sharpest basic antagonisms are no longer between European nations but between Europe and America.

17. The situation within the Soviet Union, our fatherland, must be of the utmost concern for us. The difficulty and delicacy of the subject must not lead to less discussion but to more. There is no question but that, on the whole, here comrade Trotsky was correct both in stressing industrialization and the necessity of a "plan", and in proposing an intesification of the war on the kulak. When there is recalled Bucharin's slogan to the peasantry "Enrich yourselves" and how there was solemnly discussed in Russia the possibility of the "kulaks growing into socialism", when there is recalled the arguments that any plan of industrialization was "too premature" and would lead to terrible catastrophes and "war in the village", when there is recalled how backward the original industrialization plans were and how far the masses outstripped the "Party leaders", then the conclusion is ripe that the attack on comrade Trotsky on this question only hid the Right opportunism of the Stalin-Bucharin regime.

The Five-Year Plan

The five year plan, belated as it was, and its speedy execution, mark a tremendous step forward. The industrialization of the Soviet State must tend greatly to strengthen the revolutionary movement and tend to hasten the end of capitalism. But the economic progress of the U.S.S.R. does not BY ITSELF NECESSARILY lead to an advance of the world revolution. If with such an economic advance there should be fastened upon the Communist Parties still more the theory of building socialism in one country, if this should lead not to an international but a nationalist viewpoint, if this should in turn lead the C.I. leadership to playing with and a sacrifice of foreign sections of the C.I., if this should fasten the hold of the bureaucrats still more, if this should lead to Trotsky deportations and Blumkin murders and violence to every Communist opposition movement, then indeed it is possible to state that unless the Communists throughout the world (aided by the very economic advance of the Soviet Union) can guard against this degeneration from Leninism it is possible to have an economic advance of the Soviet Union simultaneously with a setback to the world proletarian revolution. Trotsky's exposure of the elements of Thermidor generating within the Soviet Union is absolutely correct.

Section D. 18. The Comintern today is in a profound crisis. The narrowing down and great loss of prestige of the C.I. and the mass expulsions show how deeply opportunism was part of the Communist movement. The formation of three different separately organized international Communist groups speaks of the disintegration of the movement. But it also marks a step forward since such a situation exposes the rottenness in all groups, hardens the real Leninists and prepares the way for new advances.

We owe it primarily and above all to L.D.Trotsky for exposing the situation since Lenin died, for bringing to light the Testament of Lenin which the other leaders had deliberately hidden, for exposing the forgeries of Lenin's writings attempted, and for bringing to light many facts of Party history concealed by the bureaucrats fom the membership.

However it, seems that comrade Trotsky is incorrect in designating the struggle between Bucharin and Stalin (and the national groups around them) as one between "Right" and "Centrist" tendencies in the Communist movement. It is in reality a struggle between two forms of the "Right". Both philosophically and politically the conception of a "Centrist" COMMUNIST wing is wrong. Centrism can be used as designating Socialists but not Communists. This was Lenin's usage of the term. Practically, it gives the illusion that the "Centrists" are more to the "Left" than the "Right" and that "Centrists" are more easily swayed and have no real policy of their own.

19. In the United States, the disintegration of the Communist Party has exposed three groups with definite Right wing tendencies. The putschism of the official Communist Party factionalists is not the wrong estimation of those too impatient and too eager to struggle, but a deliberate make-believe to conceal their utter Right wing bankruptcy. The theory of building socialism in one country, their attitude on colonial questions, their deliberate isolation from the masses, their conception that leaders of a Communist Party can be liars and fakers trying to bluff both Moscow and the membership, and can reach leadership without ever having been called to carry out responsible mass work in a Communist manner before becoming leaders, their violence against Communist groups, these are some of the things that show on what road this clique marches.

The Communist "Majority" group (Lovestone) shows just as bad tendencies. The failure to analyze international questions (China, Russia, etc.) and to link up these questions in the closest degree with questions of the United States; the "Right" line when these questions are approached, the wrong estimation both of the whole present period of post-war capitalism and of the present situation inside and outside the United States and the complete failure to understand the many Right wing mistakes (including the methods of dealing with the Trotsky opposition) that were committed by the leaders of this group as leaders of the Party. These are but part of the evidence to show how firmly rooted the Right tendencies of this group have become.

The Communist League (Opposition) also has shown definite "Right" tendencies. But the Right tendences have NOT flowed from comrade Trotsky and the International Left Opposition—now that the true position of the "Trotsky" opposition is known—but are peculiar to its American section. The May 1929 factional platform, the passivity and sectarian leanings, the absolute and complete lack of self-criticism and failure to see that the Cannon faction within the Party was as un-Leninist as any of the others, these defects flowed from the fact that the American section of the Left International Opposition was too close to but a reconstituted Cannon faction in the beginning of its formation. However there must be admitted the great service such a faction did render in the publication and popularization of the principles of the Left International Opposition.

The crying need of the hour today is absolute ideological intransigeance, plus the working together of all Communist groups. One of the crassest forms of opportunism was the factional unity attempted in the Party in 1928 (and before) and which was only the obverse side of the unprincipled factionalism that had existed before merely in another form. The correct solution of the momentous questions of the day on the basis of Leninism stand above all questions of formal discipline.

At the same time all Communist groups must work together on the basis of the recognition of the Communist character of each group. The Communist "Majority" opposition group and the Communist League group by working together can help to reestablish mass work and to resist the violent tactics of the Party officialdom. They can help to separate the Communist movement as a whole from the Mensheviks and can deal a death blow to the theory of "fascism" and "social-fascism" thus winning the advanced workers to a Leninist conception of Party democracy. Only such a working together of Communist groups can raise those fundamental principles of Leninist organization that can reconstitute an International of Lenin.

(SEE PAGE FIVE)

Read - -

Number 14

BULLETIN OF THE RUSSIAN OPPOSITION

(Entirely in Russian)

Partial Contents

Who Will Pevail?—N.M.: "News" in the Party.—The Political Biography of Stalin. —ALFA:Notes of a Journalist—A.T.: Collectivization as It Really Is (Letter from the Russian countryside).—N.MARKIN: The Persecution of the Bolshevik-Leninists as the Principal Element in Preparing the 16th Party Congres.—LETTERS FROM THEU.S.S.R.: Letter from Moscow; A letter from exile; On Rakovsky; etc., etc.—L.D.Trotsky: Stalin as a Theortician—L.D. Trotsky: On the "Defenders" of the October Revolution—And numerous other features.

25cents a copy 18 cents in bundles

Order from

G. Clarke, 25 Third Ave., Rm. 4, N.Y.C.

A Letter from Shanghai

What Is Going On In China?

SHANGHAI—

The year 1982-29 may be described as a period of a certain economic revival of the Chinese bourgeoisie. Three conditions aided the bourgeoise to restore its economy: a prosperous gain in agricultural harvest in the second half of 1927 and the first half of 1928; the ebb tide of the strike movement as a result of the proletariat's defeat; the temporary cessation of the civil war and the restoration of inland communication . The Chinese bourgeoisie, taking advantage of this good situation, restored its economic power. Up to 1930, the bourgeoisie had wholly recovered in the factories destroyed by the war. The general profit of the principal industry—textile—had surpassed the record after the war, while the import and export of merchant ships had increased by 20 percent higher than before, and domestic and foreign trade had increased proportionately. But the rise came to an end with the civil war and agrarian famine at the beginning of 1930.

In 1929, the war between Chiang Kai-Shek and the Kwangsi clique broke out. In 1930, the Chiang-Yen Sih-Shan war broke out. In the consideration of the latter, there are two different opinions: the one of Lee Li-san, the present leader of the Chinese Communist Party, the other is that of the Leninist Opposition.

According to Lee Li-san, this is a war of the classes, that is, the revolutionary high wave, because, according to his "analysis", the participants in the civil war represent different classes: Feng Yu-Hsiang represents the petty bourgeoise; Kwangsi, the landlords; and Chiang the national bourgeoisie.

The National Action Committee of the Chinese Bolshevik-Leninists (Opposition) has already declared that such wars are unavoidable results after the fall of the proletarian forces. The imperialists in China and their agents, the Chinese bourgeoisie are intoxicated with the desire to split up China still further because the local governments established by these splits are the only safe guarantee for the exceptional power and interests of the imperialists and the government of Chiang Kai-Shek is the "provisional government" supported unanimously by the imperialists and the local bourgeoisie as well in order to suppress the revolutionary forces after the exhaustion of the proletariat and the forces under its leadership; but the full attention of the imperialists and the whole local bourgeoisie is concentrated on the splitting up process: the civil war is only a means for the purpose of split.

Since the "provisional government" (Nanking) has succeeded in its role and task of suppressing the revolutionary forces. then its power must be weakened by civil wars to the level of the former Peking government, while the local powers must also be reduced to the "Tuchun" period before 1925. All these are natural phenomena under the regime of different imperialists. The temporary (and only temporary) restraining of the militarists from civil wars is possible only under the most reactionary regime which suppressess the workers and peasants completely. But this is a temporary restraint which only means the preparation of new and more violent wars. The complete elimination of civil wars among the militarists is **conceivable only through the seizure of power by the proletariat in the coming, third revolutionary uprising.**

Under the condition of permanent civil war the masses are impelled to recognize the real political countenance of the Communist Party and to turn towards the Left. It is inevitable that during this period the bourgeois groups in opposition to the one in power, will hide themselves more cunningly behind the "Left" mask in order to betray the masses. Here one may assume two alternatives for the near future: The "reorganizationsts" and the "West Hill Conference group" will put aside their own reformist platforms in order to unite with Yen Sih-Shan, Feng Yu-Hsiang, Kwangsi war lords, and organize a government whose policy will become more reactionary than Chiang Kai-Shek's. The Centrists of the Kuo Min Tang like the socalled board of "New Life"* will surely stand in opposition to this bourgeois government under the mask of a "Left" turn. Or some of them will split from the ranks of the "reorganizationists" to oppose the policy of Wang Chin Wei and Co. This is the first possible alternative.

The other one would be more dangerous to the proletariat. The Left bourgeoisie with its existing organizations and under the mask of an "ultra-Left" turn will con-

---

This letter represent the point of view of the "Our Word" group of the Left Opposition in China. The Militant disagrees seriously with a number of statements and opinions expressed by comrade Peter in estimating the present situation in the country, with particular regard to the guerilla warfare, on which we have already written and will continue to write in future issues. Nevertheless, the first-hand account of the situation in China which this letter offers makes it publication in the Militant of great interest and value.

---

sent to the bourgeois democratic revolution and to the "democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants", to the slogan "Unite with the Soviet Union" only under the condition that the property of the Chinese bourgeoisie is not confiscated. Then, under this mask, the "ultra-Left" bourgeoise will again be able to betray the proletariat and get material support from the Soviet Union.

"Can it be considered that the revolution of 1925-1927 has at least partly satisfied the basic interests of Chinese capitalism?" said comrade Trotsky in his criticism of the Comintern program. "No. China is now just as far from national unity and from customs independence as it was prior to 1925. But as a matter of fact the creation of one home market and its protection from cheaper foreign goods is for the Chinese bourgeoisie a question of life and death. It is a question only second in importance to that of maintaining the basis of its class domination over the proletariat and the rural poor. But also for the Japanese and for the British bourgeoisie, the maintenance of China in its colonial state is a question of no less importance than the question of economic independence is for the Chinese bourgeoisie. That is why the Chinese bourgeoisie will still display many zig-zag moves towards the Left in its future policy. For those who like united fronts there will still be many chances in the future."

The present task of the Chinese Opposition is to avoid the two dangers mentioned above by all means. So that the most important work to be carried out is the slogan of a national (Constituent) Assembly through which we may sharply disclose all the deceivers of the "opposition" bourgeoisie. On the other hand, with the aid of this slogan, we must try our best to carry on a propaganda for the dictatorship of the proletariat and nationalization of the means of production, establishing firmly the real program of the proletariat which will be contrary to the obscure "bourgeois democratic" platform of the Stalinists.

In the Party

In recent months, the official Communist Party, with the opportunist program adopted by its sixth congress under the leadership of the ultra-Right winger Lee Li-san, came to an agreement with the reorganizationists, compromising the struggle between the poor peasantry and the Kulak. But under the "Left" turn of Stalin, this ultra-Right policy was wiped out by diplomatic decree of the Comintern. Chi Chiu-Bai and Mif, after their arrival in China, formally criticized the former policy of agreement between Lee Li-san and the reorganizationists. Nevertheless such a "Left" attempt does not correct the fundamental principle error of the Party line, since with a course based on the "bourgeois character" of the revolution, "temporary" agreements with the liberal bourgeoisie are a natural conclusion.

At present, the Party regime is still under the influence of the Lee Li-sans. That the powerful Lee agrees to publish the criticism of Chi Chiu-Bai and Mif in the official Party organ is only a false demonstration to the Comintern. But it does show that the ultra-Right spirit of Lee Li-san has prevailed strongly in the whole Party. For instance, the serious struggle between Tchu-Deh and Mu Tse-tong in the Red Army. Comrade Mu Tse-Tong is more to the Left and may stand on the side of the Party masses against Tchu-Deh. But the Central Party regime of the ultra-Right wing has decided to replace comrade Mu Tse-Tong with the follower of Lee Li-san, Yun Tai-in.

The history of the Russian revolution teaches us that in the ranks of Menshevism there were many differences, especially on the question of relations with the constitutionalists. The Mensheviks were divided into cooperators and opponents. But on the fundamental problems of the revolution they unanimously opposed the Bolsheviks. So does Chinese Menshevism. The reorganizationists are clearly no other than the Chinese Constitutionalists, the most dangerous enemy of the proletariat. Therefore on the question of relations with the Chinese Constitutionalists, whatever differences exist among the Chinese Mensheviks like Chi Chiu-Bai and Lee Li-san the Bolshevik Opposition can never come to agreement with them. They are for the road of the "bourgeois character" of the revolution and the "democratic dictatorship", while we are for the proletarian dictatorship and nationalization of the means of production.

The Red Army

The Red Army in China is an ever disputed question. In the ranks of disguised Oppositionists in China, the attitude towards the Red army has been falsified by saying that it is simply "an unorganized disturbance of bandits, vagabonds and villains" (Tchen Du-Siu and Liurze groups). The Stalinists are of the opinion that the Soviets of the occupied provinces are the proletarian power, and the Red Army the 100 percent military force of the latter.

As a matter of fact, the present Chinese Soviets are not established on the basis of the class struggle between landlords and peasantry, not to speak of the leadership of the proletariat. The present Soviets are only the jobless grouped in the village in order to obtain a living. Their attitude towards the peasants at work takes the form of a conqueror, so that the Soviets are not considered by the peasant as his own organization. The Soviets can make agreements with the upper classes in the village because of their separation from the sympathetic support of the peasant masses. In most of the Soviet districts, the leadership does not accomplish the division of the land, confiscation of the merchant shops, but, on the contrary, carries out the slogan of "Protect the merchant shops and money-lenders". The leaders, furthermore, do not disarm the bandits in order to arm the poor peasantry, but permits them to rob freely.

But although the Soviets under the leadership of the Stalinists are not the power of the workers and peasantry, they are peasant war groups, depending upon the activities of their leaders, like the group under Hong Siu-Chuan, the Taipings leader. Such groups are able to exist even in the period of the greatest consolidation of the reactionary regime; militarist civil war makes their further growth possible.

In these peasant war groups, the proletariat must by all means acquire the leading position. But the leadership can easily be captured by "populist" parties, which seek to make the peasants independent from the workers. The Stalinists are helping the development of such "populist" parties. First, they attempt to organize purely peasant Soviets under the slogan of the "democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry". Secondly, they do not tell the peasants that the revolutionary situation has weakened, but play up to the narrow-minded and prideful thoughts of the peasantry that the workers in China are much more backward than the peasants. Third, they do not develop the independent spirit of the proletarian struggle, but spread exaggerated news about the Red Army in their organ with the largest type as if its victory were the road out for the workers. In a word, all the propaganda of the Stalinists obectively incites the "populist" ideas of the peasant's independence from the workers. From our point of view, the Stalinists in China are undergoing a process of "Social Revolutionarization".

To want to eliminate such peasant Soviets and their struggle in no way coincides with the standpoint of the Opposition. Despite the fact that they are not workers' and peasants' Soviets under the leadership of the proletariat. they are far better for us than the power of the landlords. In the future revolutionary rising wave, such peasants' Soviets will be very easily turned into a workers' and peasants' Soviet power, preparing for the proletarian dictatorship. It is without doubt that during the reactionary period, the organization of workers' and peasants' Soviets is impossible; but the existence of isolated peasant war groups in so widespread a country as China is quite possible. It is the remaining spurt of the village revolution of 1925-27. The duties of the present leadership are to agitate for the more extensive development of the city labor movement, to lead it and to prolong its existence before it is completely exhausted and destroyed by reactionaries.

The Chinese Bolshevik-Leninists (Opposition) recognizes that the significance of the peasant war groups is quite different from that of the workers' and peasants' Soviets. But our sympathy is wholly on the side of such peasant wars. We insistently protest against the shameless stories about them spread by the landlords and the bourgeoisie. We speak to the working classes that these Soviets are peasant war groups, much more advanced than those of landlords and that the workers should unite with them. Bct we do not betray the workers like the Stalinists do by saying that these are the very Soviets of the future proletarian dictatorship.

The capture of Changsha, capital of Hunan province, by the Red Army has given a great impetus to the demonstration on August 1st in Shanghai. We distributed our leaflets with an "Appeal to the Workers, Peasants and Soldiers of the Red Army for the capture of Changsha". There we declared that the capture of Changsha by the heroic militants in the peasant war deserves the praise of the world proletariat. The heroic Red Army should not only make further attacks on the bourgeois militarists but should also carry out the confiscation of property, Chinese and foreign, divide the land of the Kulak and landlords among the poor peasants in spite of the Stalinist opportunist line etc., etc. We hope to send you a report on the Changsha situation, the present strike movement, etc., within the next few days.

—PETER

---

* Theoretical organ of the Kuo Min Tang Centrists, whose task is to explain their theories by a "materialism" and "Marxism" of their own.

If the number on your wrapper is

55

then your subscription to the **Militant** has expired. Renew immediately in order to avoid missing any issues.

In the Party

Why I Joined the Left Opposition

Comade Sylvia Bleeker, organizer of of the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union, and one of the oldest members of of the Party, whose case we spoke of in the Militant, two issues ago, has been expelled for "Trotskyism". She sends us the following declaration:

* * *

The statement by the Party Central Control Commission on my expulsion **(Daily Worker, 9-3-1930)** needs further explanation. It was not merely a statement of my expulsion but a slander and misrepresentation of my relation to the struggle in general. And while I am sure that every worker or member of our Union who read it felt repelled by such contemtible slander, I nevertheless wish to make a few explanatory remarks.

Records Needs No Apology

My record of work, activities and devotion to the Needle Trades Workers Industrial Union and the Party needs no apology. It has been known to the workers for almost 10 years. Any work assigned to me was carried out faithfully and flawlessly. And were it not for my agreement with the platform of the Communist League, the Party would still speak of my loyalty.

My adherence to the "Trotsky Opposition in no way eradicates my former record. On the contrary, it is a logical consequence of my serious and vital concern with the policies of the C.I. and its American section.

Since when is one a good Communist who doesn't think, question or disagree? Since when has it become our slogan: Obey and not ask questions? The Communist Party is not a religious sect (and even their history is filled with "periods of questioning"). The Party is the political weapon of the workers in the fight against the capitalist system, and it is the duty of every Communist to use this weapon to its maximum effectiveness. We need the Communist Party to lead the working class in all its struggles ; we need it to fight and expose reformist influence among the workers; we need it to build the kernel of the proletarian revolution. No sooner do the policies of the Party fail to live up to its historical role than every Communist must point it out, criticize and if compelled, organize a faction to correct these policies.

That is exactly what comrade Trotsky has been doing, and that is exactly what the American Left Opposition is doing at present. The criticism made by comrade Trotsky from 1923 to now, whether nationally or internationally, has been entirely confirmed by events, much more than any of us expected. And it is because of the very correctness of his prognoses that he doesn't stand alone but has a movement of devoted class-conscious workers behind him. Every day brings new groups of adherents to the course of Leninism as against the policies of Stalin's regime, which is leading the Party into the abyss.

A Contemptble Slander

The C.C.C. statement that I "covered myself with the cloak of Trotskyism to escape from the struggle" is a despicable slander. No serious worker believes it now and will surely not believe it in the future. I remain in the ranks of the class conscious workers and will work together with them regardless of difficulties. But true to my principles, I shall never agree with either the present official policies of the Party which are disastrous, nor with the bureaucratization of the Party. The average member in our Party is becoming a mere cog and not a sober, conscious fighter. This is not a fault of the Communist ideal but of the present Party leadeship.

The frequent changes and uncertainties in the Party and trade union policies, without any broad discussion at the units, the Party fractions, introduce confusion, apathy and general loss of faith by the rank and file. Reorganizations take place at such a tempo that it is no longer possible to follow them up. These constant reorganizations are resorted to as a substitute for correct policies, but they are absolutely wrong and suicidical. The fact is that the attendance at Party fraction meetings has been reduced to a fourth of the membership. The mechanical introduction of policies, their mechanical execution, abolition and re-introduction (as in the Amalgamated Clothing Workers) are ruinous.

Elections in the Party are becoming a word of the past. Secretaries and financial secretaries can no longer be elected, only appointed by the bureau!

Can or should a real Communist overlook all this? Is it not time to make an end to all these ruinous policies? Regardless of what the offical apparatus does—expel, slander, temporarily isolate us, beat us up, break up meetings—it is our turn to speak . A Communist who keeps quiet now when danger is facing our Party is a coward and a slacker against the working class. The differences in the Comintern can no longer be concealed. The platform of the Leninist Opposition can no longer be misrepresented or misquoted. The facts are out in the daylight.

Communism Weakened by Expulsions

By expelling us from the Party's ranks, our strength is only weakened. By driving us out of active work in the trade unions and auxiliary organizations, the Party officials are deliberately hurting the cause of the workers. We want to be in the Party. We want to be in the trade unions. We want to be in every class struggle. We are ready and willing to sacrifice as we have proved in the past. Vicious attacks and slander will not solve the problem.

We ask for a broad and genuine discussion of the problems we are now facing. We demand that a halt be called to the unheard of repression and persecution of the Opposition comrades in the Soviet Union. The bureaucrats cannot and will not tear us away from the ranks of Communism and the working class!

—SYLVIA BLEEKER

Stalinist Party Folly in St. Louis

ST. LOUIS—

Since the expulsion of the Opposition, the C.P. has practically ceased to exist in this territory. With the loss of its best members it no longer has any contact with the trade unions. Jealous of Opposition influence in the trade unions the Party finally succeeded by underhanded methods in getting our members expelled from them. In consequence, all militant Left wing elements have been barred from participation in the unions, leaving the field entirely in the hands of bureaucratic reactionaries. Well known militants like MacMillan and Goldberg have been expelled becaus of these malicious and senseless Party tactics.

Opposition Organizes Unemployed

The Communist Opposition was the first in this territory to organize an Unemployed Council which led a mass demonstration of 1,500 on January 3rd through the business section of St. Louis. The Party was invited to participate but refused on the grounds that they were not the organizers.

Seeing our success and in order not to be outdone, the Party finally organized its own council. The Opposition, knowing their council was in fact nothing but a name, nevertheless, sent delegates asking for a united front of all workers against unemployment. This the Party not only refused but threw our delegates out. Because of this action, the one or two members whom the Party had succeeded in gaining, left and came over to our group.

Remembering our success in demonstrating, the local Stalinists decided to arrange a series of demonstrations of their own. These turned out complete fizzles, each being a bigger failure than its predecessor. The Party speakers, instead of tackling the problem of unemployment turned their meeting into anti-Trotsky meetings, which of course meant nothing to the rank and file unemployed. The workers, disgusted with such tactics. left and are now in our ranks.

After two months of strenous effort the Party, succeeded with the co-operation of the Opposition, in mustering about 200 demonstrators for the Sacco-Vanzetti protest meeting. The Stalinists, instead of exposing the system which burned Sacco and Vanzetti, turned this meeting also into an anti-Trotsky affair. They also decided to devote their talents to a strenuous attack on the one poor wilted Lovestoneite in the city calling him among other things a social menace and a Sacco-Vanzetti lyncher. much to the amusement of the spectators.

In spite of Party persecution the Opposition goes forward. With the exception of the officials, the rank and file members have been neutralized. This has occured in spite of the fact that members are expelled when caught talking to Opposition sympathizers or when found attending Opposition meetings.

A case in point is the recent expulsion of the secretary of the Y.C.L., Frank Wall, one of the most active of the League members when caught by Party spies attending Shachtman's lecture. He was summarily "dismissed". It seems that it is no longer necessary to endorse the Opposition platform for expulsion, but expulsions are now in order for members daring to associate with "Trotskyists".

While the Party goes onward in its path of complete isolation, the Opposition grows in membership and influence among rank and file workers. The Left wing militants continue in their task of carrying forward true Communist education. co-operating with all workers, and aiding the sale of the Militant. The Militant now has a larger subscription list in this city than the **Daily Worker.** The sale of Klorkeit also is not smaller than the sale of the Jewish Morning Freiheit. Consequently with the coming of the fall cool weather we expect to make even bigger strides and still more successes.

—H.L.GOLDBERG

A Reply to Comrade Weisbord

(Continued form Page 5)

the native bourgeoisie leads them into a dispute with the British imperialists which "unleashes the eneregy of the masses". But so did Kerensky "unleash the energy of the masses". And like him, the Ghandists at the same time **fetter** the energy of the masses. A genuine unleashing—and proper direction—of the energies of the masses can happen only by fighting as mercilessly against the national bourgeoisie and for the independence of the proletariat (which alone enables it to lead behind it the peasantry) as the Bolsheviks fought against the Kerensky and Menshevik compomisers in 1917. This must be repeated and repeated until it penetrates every fiber of the Indian revolutionists.

It is with comrade Weisbord's proposals on the various groups in the movement that the Left Opposition has its sharpest disagreement. Advocacy of such views by a leading comrades is contrary to all we stand for. "All Communists groups must work together on the basis of the recognition of the Communist character of each group. The Communist 'Majority' group and the Communist League group by working together can help re-establish mass work . . . they can help to separate the Communist movement as a whole from the Mensheviks", etc., etc. This is false from beginning to end.

We recognize the Communist character of the Right wing **only** insofar as it still groups a number of good Communist workers whom the incompetent Centrist bureaucracy was unable to hold. We contend that the Right wing now occupies a position midway between social democracy (Menshevism) and Communism—not for long, it is true, as is shown by the passage of some of its leading strata directly into the camp of Amsterdam and the international of August 1914. How can we, the Marxist wing of the movement, unite with this semi-Menshevik wing (a bloc which under present conditions would mean a movement directed against the official Communist movement), in order to "seperate" the Communist movement as a whole from the Mensheviks"? How can a bloc with the Right wing "re-establish mass work", when it is the whole philosophy of the Right wing that has brought the Communist movement into such isolation from the masses (Chinese revolution, British general strike, India, etc., etc.) into opportunist swamps from which Centirsm is now trying ineffectively, to issue by means of the ultra-Leftist rope?

Road to Ruin, Not to Victory

Such a policy, combined as it is with comrade Weisbord's entirely false estimate of Centrism (his denial of it, in fact) is the shortest road to destruction for the Left Opposition and a disavowal of its historical function This is clear from all the experiences of the Opposition in Europe. Our road is not that of Urbahns, Pollack and Paz who only discredited the Opposition and reduced what they controlled to hopeless sects.

* * *

On the basis of his present views on a number of vital questions, the national committee has decided that it cannot accept comrade Weisbord for membership in the League. At the same time it expressed the hope and desire that further reflection and discussion would make it possible for comrade Weisbord to find his place as a fighter—and a valuable one—in the ranks of the Opposition. We have welcomed this discussion and the criticisms made by comrade Weisbord, particularly because it offered the opportunity for a recapitulation of our point of view. At the same time, the national committee decided, in view of Weisbord's closeness to the views of the Opposition, to invite his collaboration in fields of work conforming to his position.

National Committee
Communist League of America (Opposition)

BOOKS - FOR - WORKERS

SINCE LENIN DIED by Max Eastman, Labour Publishing Company, London, 1925, 158 pages.

The fact that this book earned the concentrated scorn of the latter-day Comintern leadership, should immediately interest all Communists suffering under the deluge of "anti-Trotskyist" verbiage distributed in recent years under the guise of Leninism. Aspirants to leadership, in all English-speaking countries, from Rothstein to Browder, finding the thorny path of fight against capitalism not so promising, have turned with enthusiasm to slinging mud at the Russian Opposition and its leader, comrade Trotsky. But the authority of these slanderers of the revolution is shortlived. This book is one of the nails in their political coffin.

Coming fresh from the Thirteenth Party Congress of the Russian Party (May, 1924) and the hysterical campaign leading up to Trotsky's resignation as president of the Revolutionary Military Soviet in January, 1925, Max Eastman was the first to publish the authentic documents of the controversy in English. He was in Russia during the whole development of the fight, witnessed the consolidation of the shady opponents of Leninism under the crafty leadership of the "Triumvirate". The book is valuable to us now because in it are published the original documents, theses, letters and press articles of the period. These documents have already been supplemented, amplified and a thousand times verified in the writings of comrade Trotsky and other leaders of the Russian Opposition. Also by the shamefaced confessions of Zinoviev, Kamenev, etc. when they were no longer of use to Stalin.

Eastman will be remembered for unswerving courage and determination in the face of the solid mass of howling bureaucrats, to speak the truth and prove it. He has the honor of being one of the first to be expelled from the American Party for supporting the Russian Opposition. He certainly was the first to bring the documents and platform of the Russian Opposition out of the "illegality" imposed by Stalin and into the light of day. —CARL COWL

Price: Cloth, $1; paper, 50 cents. Order through the Militant.

Φ

Subscribe to the Militant and be sure of getting it regularly through the mails.